

**To:** Chris Petersen[Petersen.Chris@epa.gov]; Webster, Susan[webster.susan@epa.gov]; Smith, Monica[smith.monica@epa.gov]  
**From:** Phillips, Pam  
**Sent:** Wed 8/19/2015 11:00:36 PM  
**Subject:** FW: Draft comments 8/16/2015-for DWB criteria

Making sure you have this as I did not see your names

**From:** Edlund, Carl  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 19, 2015 5:47 PM  
**To:** Hosch, Claudia  
**Cc:** Garcia, David; Honker, William; Rawls, Maurice; Jones, Curry; Crossland, Ronnie; Phillips, Pam  
**Subject:** Re: Draft comments 8/16/2015-for DWB criteria

Thanks...these things may be very relevant to the watershed long term plan.

Sent from my iPad

On Aug 19, 2015, at 3:22 PM, Hosch, Claudia <[hosch.claudia@epa.gov](mailto:hosch.claudia@epa.gov)> wrote:

David, our preliminary findings are as follows:

CWA 106 funding can be used to cover monitoring of river conditions, monitoring of aquifer conditions, and monitoring of stream sediments. NMED has an active FY 2016-2017 grant that was recently awarded partial funding. If it is determined that this vehicle can be used (after discussion with NMED), the work plan will need to be revised to reflect the new activities to be performed by NMED.

The SRFs could be used as well (through their set asides)for the activities mentioned. We'd like to point out that there are existing ULOs in the DWSRF, so these could be utilized first. This would also entail revisions to workplans.

I understand supplemental funding was added to SRF set-asides to assist the states after hurricane Sandy. EPA HQ is also researching this possibility.

Thanks,

Claudia

Claudia V. Hosch

Associate Director

Water Quality Protection Division

Assistance Programs Branch

EPA Region 6, Dallas, TX

214 665 6464



<image006.jpg>

**From:** Garcia, David

**Sent:** Monday, August 17, 2015 10:52 AM

**To:** Hosch, Claudia

**Cc:** Honker, William; Rawls, Maurice; Jones, Curry; Crossland, Ronnie; Edlund, Carl  
**Subject:** FW: Draft comments 8/16/2015-for DWB criteria

Claudia,

Please read Ronnie's email below. Are there existing NMED grant mechanisms that can be used for support of long term monitoring:

- River Condition:** Routine stream sampling with the same analytes should continue by the EPA in order to monitor water quality changes with stream flow changes.
  
- Aquifer Condition:** EPA should continue with follow up monitoring of the same analytes in the source water for potentially impacted public groundwater wells after typical pumping has occurred.
  
- Long term Sediment Impacts:** The impacts of processing and treating source water with such increased levels of contaminated sediment are unknown. DWB would want confirmation from EPA that they would continue to monitor sediment quality and assume responsibility for any future damages/repairs to treatment facilities that may result from the contaminated sediment.

David F. Garcia

Deputy Director

Water Quality

Protection Division

U.S. EPA Region 6

1445 Ross Avenue (Mail Code: 6WQ-D)

Dallas, Texas 75202-2733

Phone: (214) 665-7593

## **Follow EPA Region 6**

<image007.png><image008.png>



**From:** Edlund, Carl

**Sent:** Monday, August 17, 2015 10:35 AM

**To:** Crossland, Ronnie

**Cc:** Webster, Susan; Petersen, Chris; Bernier, Roberto; Garcia, David; Restivo, Angela

**Subject:** Re: Draft comments 8/16/2015-for DWB criteria

Is it possible to separate short term (2 weeks or less) from long term (2 weeks +)? actions.

Sediment: If we did TCLP on sediment samples that we have already and find that it passes, wouldn't that resolve future concerns from storm events? Seems to me that future release events from Gold King or other sites would be a whole new thing and outside of this agreement.

Drinking water: in the next 2 weeks we should get results from the short holding time systems (Morningstar, others), if they test safe, wouldn't that mean that longer retention systems would test even safer? I do understand that NMED wants EPA to be accountable. What actions would be needed if the systems have Gold King contaminants.

Regarding warning systems: I can see that NM was embarrassed by lack of communication regarding the surge (so were we) and wants something to prevent that in the future. Not sure USGS/ river warning system would solve what is a communication problem. Would an intergovernmental agreement between NM, R-6, and R-8 on emergency communication be better?

Do we have a compilation of different funding mechanisms in place already that might be used for future actions? 106 grant, SDW grants, cooperative agreements with different stakeholders? We could invent new ones but existing would be better.

Does this help?

Sent from my iPad

On Aug 17, 2015, at 8:23 AM, Crossland, Ronnie <[Crossland.Ronnie@epa.gov](mailto:Crossland.Ronnie@epa.gov)> wrote:

Carl,

I agree that the 100 day timeframe seems like a long time. However, the biggest issue is associated with the sediment basins. It appears that NMED wants EPA to take responsibility for the disposal of all sediment from DW Systems for the foreseeable future. Both total and dissolved sample results indicate low levels of metals. In addition, NMED wants EPA to install some type of river warning system to warn operators of either storm events that might stir up sediment or in the event another mine has a release. We have sampled the sediment and it below screening levels. Monitoring for future events is outside the scope of this response. These issues need to be resolved at a higher level.

Ronnie

**From:** Edlund, Carl

**Sent:** Monday, August 17, 2015 8:41 AM

**To:** Webster, Susan

**Cc:** Petersen, Chris; Bernier, Roberto; Crossland, Ronnie

**Subject:** Re: Draft comments 8/16/2015-for DWB criteria

Thanks...largely good but I have a few questions: Short term seems pretty long (up to 100 days for water to go thru the system); we should be well past immediate Removal Action. Wouldn't this be part of long term response? Payment through a grant (Water grant to NMED?).

Sent from my iPad

On Aug 16, 2015, at 7:37 PM, Webster, Susan <[webster.susan@epa.gov](mailto:webster.susan@epa.gov)> wrote:

Draft tonight.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Restivo, Angela" <[Restivo.Angela@epa.gov](mailto:Restivo.Angela@epa.gov)>  
**Date:** August 16, 2015 at 8:23:24 PM CDT  
**To:** "Garcia, David" <[Garcia.David@epa.gov](mailto:Garcia.David@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** "Webster, Susan" <[webster.susan@epa.gov](mailto:webster.susan@epa.gov)>, "Smith, Monica" <[smith.monica@epa.gov](mailto:smith.monica@epa.gov)>, "Foster, Althea" <[Foster.Althea@epa.gov](mailto:Foster.Althea@epa.gov)>, "Ngo, Kim" <[Ngo.Kim@epa.gov](mailto:Ngo.Kim@epa.gov)>, "Loston, Anthony" <[Loston.Anthony@epa.gov](mailto:Loston.Anthony@epa.gov)>, "Crossland, Ronnie" <[Crossland.Ronnie@epa.gov](mailto:Crossland.Ronnie@epa.gov)>, "McCasland, Mark" <[McCasland.Mark@epa.gov](mailto:McCasland.Mark@epa.gov)>, "Martin, John" <[martin.john@epa.gov](mailto:martin.john@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Draft comments 8/16/2015-for DWB criteria

This is a draft version.

Angela Restivo

Compliance Officer

Drinking Water Section

U.S. EPA Region 6

1445 Ross Ave (6WQ-SD)

Dallas,Texas 75202-2733

phone: 214-665-7123

<Gold King Mine Spill All Clear Criteria Draft comments8162015.docx>